

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 6, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

All pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, on the grounds that they were not considered to be patentable over the *Fukumitsu et al.* patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,052). In setting forth the rejection based upon this reference, the Office Action states that the term "photographing apparatus" is being interpreted broadly to encompass a camera that is connected to a computer. Thus, with reference to Figure 2 of the *Fukumitsu* patent, for example, the combination of the personal computer 10 with the camera 18 incorporated into its structure is being interpreted as a "photographing apparatus."

In the context of the present invention, however, the photographing apparatus is not a component of the personal computer or other processing device that forms a node on the network. Rather, the photographing apparatus is a separate structure which is connected to the network node as a peripheral device. See, for example, page 2, lines 10-12. To clarify the distinctions between the claimed subject matter and the prior art represented by the *Fukumitsu* patent, the independent claims have been amended to more explicitly recite that the interface of the photographing apparatus connects the photographing apparatus as a peripheral device to a processor that forms a node on the network. In other words, the photographing apparatus is distinct from the network node itself.


It is respectfully submitted that the *Fukumitsu* patent does not suggest an arrangement of the type recited in the claims. Since the photographing apparatus is distinct from the computer, or other processing device, that forms the network node, the term

photographing apparatus can only be interpreted to read on the camera 18, and not the combination of the camera and the personal computer. This camera does not include, among other elements, a display for displaying a network structure, as recited in each of the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the *Fukumitsu et al.* patent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: 9/29/03

By: 
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620